

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

PARTIES

- As used in this Complaint, the word "Plaintiff" shall refer to Plaintiff 2. Alonso Menchaca.
- As used in this Complaint, the word "Defendant" shall refer to all 3. Defendants named in this Complaint.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF BY PLAINTIFF AGAINST DEFENDANT BREACH OF THE IMPLIED WARRANTY OF MERCHANTABILITY **CAL. CIV. CODE § 1794**

- On or about November 24, 2006, Plaintiff purchased a 2007 GMC 4. Yukon, 1GKFC13J57R257287 (hereafter "Vehicle") which was manufactured, distributed, or sold by Defendant. The total consideration which Plaintiff paid or agreed to pay, including taxes, license, and finance charges is \$49,130.00. The Vehicle was purchased primarily for personal, family, or household purposes. Plaintiff purchased the Vehicle from a person or entity engaged in the business of manufacturing, distributing, or selling consumer goods at retail.
- 5. In connection with the purchase, Plaintiff received an express written warranty in which Defendant undertook to preserve or maintain the utility or performance of the Vehicle or to provide compensation if there is a failure in utility or performance for a specified period of time. The warranty provided, in relevant part, that in the event a defect developed with the Vehicle during the warranty period, Plaintiff could deliver the Vehicle for repair services to Defendant's representative and the Vehicle would be repaired.
- 6. During the warranty period, the Vehicle contained or developed defects which cause the vehicle to be unable to start, and defects with the fuel system, electrical system, fuel gauge, brakes, sound system, and sunroof.
- Pursuant to Civil Code §§ 1792 and 1791.1, the sale of the Vehicle 7. was accompanied by Defendant's implied warranty of merchantability. The

CALIFORNIA 92705

SANTA ANA,

(714) 516-2700

ANDERSON LAW FIRM 2070 NORTH TUSTIN AVENUE

25

duration of the implied warranty is coextensive in duration with the duration of the express written warranty provided by Defendant.

- The implied warranty of merchantability means and includes that the 8. Vehicle will comply with each of the following requirements: (1) The Vehicle will pass without objection in the trade under the contract description; (2) The Vehicle is fit for the ordinary purposes for which such goods are used; (3) The Vehicle is adequately contained, packaged, and labeled; and (4) The Vehicle will conform to the promises or affirmations of fact made on the container or label.
- On or about November 24, 2006, or during the time period in which the implied warranty was in effect, the Vehicle contained or developed the defects stated in paragraph 6, above. The existence of each of these defects constitutes a breach of the implied warranty because the Vehicle (1) does not pass without objection in the trade under the contract description, (2) is not fit for the ordinary purposes for which such goods are used, (3) is not adequately contained, packaged, and labeled, and (4) does not conform to the promises or affirmations of fact made on the container or label.
- Plaintiff has rightfully rejected and/or justifiably revoked acceptance 10. of the Vehicle, and has exercised a right to cancel the sale. By serving this Complaint, Plaintiff does so again. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks the remedies provided in California Civil Code section 1794(b)(1), including the entire purchase price. In addition, Plaintiff seeks the remedies set forth in California Civil Code section 1794(b)(2), including the diminution in value of the Vehicle resulting from its defects. Plaintiff believes that, at the present time, the Vehicle's value is de minimis.
- Plaintiff has been damaged by Defendant's failure to comply with its 11. obligations under the implied warranty, and therefore brings this claim pursuant to Civil Code § 1794.

5

6

3

9

11

CALIFORNIA 92705

SANTA ANA,

(714) 516-2700

ANDERSON LAW FIRM

21

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Filed 02/08/2008

BY PLAINTIFF AGAINST DEFENDANT

BREACH OF THE IMPLIED WARRANTY OF FITNESS

CAL. CIV. CODE § 1794

- Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in 12. paragraphs 4 through 6 and paragraph 10, above.
- 13. Defendant is a manufacturer, distributor, or seller who had reason to know at the time of the retail sale that the Vehicle was required for a particular purpose and that the Plaintiff was relying on the Defendant's skill or judgment to select or furnish suitable goods.
- 14. Pursuant to Civil Code § 1792.1, the sale of the Vehicle was accompanied by Defendant's implied warranty that the Vehicle would be fit for Plaintiff's particular purpose. The duration of the implied warranty is coextensive in duration with the duration of the express written warranty provided by Defendant.
- On or about November 24, 2006, or during the time period in which 15. the implied warranty was in effect, the Vehicle contained or developed the defects stated in paragraph 6, above. The existence of each of these defects constitutes a breach of the implied warranty because the Vehicle is not fit for Plaintiff's particular purpose.
- Plaintiff has been damaged by Defendant's failure to comply with its 16. obligations under the implied warranty, and therefore brings this claim pursuant to Civil Code § 1794.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF BY PLAINTIFF AGAINST DEFENDANT **BREACH OF EXPRESS WARRANTY** CAL. CIV. CODE § 1794

Page 5 of 9

- 17. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 4 through 6 and paragraph 10, above.
- 18. In accordance with Defendant's warranty, Plaintiff delivered the Vehicle to Defendant's representative in this state to perform warranty repairs. Plaintiff did so within a reasonable time. Each time Plaintiff delivered the Vehicle, Plaintiff notified Defendant and its representative of the characteristics of the defects. However, the representative failed to repair the Vehicle, breaching the terms of the written warranty on each occasion.
- 19. Plaintiff has been damaged by Defendant's failure to comply with its obligations under the express warranty, and therefore brings this claim pursuant to Civil Code § 1794.
- 20. Defendant's failure to comply with its obligations under the express warranty was willful, in that Defendant and its representative were aware of their obligation to repair the Vehicle under the express warranty, but they intentionally declined to fulfill that obligation. Accordingly, Plaintiff is entitled to a civil penalty of two times Plaintiff's actual damages pursuant to Civil Code § 1794(c).

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF BY PLAINTIFF AGAINST DEFENDANT FAILURE TO PROMPTLY REPURCHASE PRODUCT CAL. CIV. CODE § 1793.2(d)

- 21. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 4 through 6, above.
- 22. Defendant and its representatives in this state have been unable to service or repair the Vehicle to conform to the applicable express warranties after a

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

ANDERSON LAW FIRM

reasonable number of attempts. Despite this fact, Defendant failed to promptly replace the Vehicle or make restitution to Plaintiff as required by Civil Code §§ 1793.2(d) and 1793.1(a)(2).

- 23. Plaintiff has been damaged by Defendant's failure to comply with its obligations pursuant to Civil Code §§ 1793.2(d) and 1793.1(a)(2), and therefore brings this claim pursuant to § 1794.
- Defendant's failure to comply with its obligations under § 1793.2(d) was willful, in that Defendant and its representative were aware that they were unable to service or repair the Vehicle to conform to the applicable express warranties after a reasonable number of repair attempts, yet Defendant failed and refused to promptly replace the Vehicle or make restitution despite Plaintiff's demand. Accordingly, Plaintiff is entitled to a civil penalty of two times Plaintiff's actual damages pursuant to § 1794(c).
- 25. Defendant does not maintain a qualified third-party dispute resolution process which substantially complies with § 1793.22. Despite Defendant's violation of § 1793.2(d) and its notice thereof, Defendant failed to comply with its obligations within a reasonable time. Accordingly, Plaintiff is entitled to a civil penalty of two times Plaintiff's actual damages pursuant to Civil Code § 1794(e).
- Plaintiff seeks civil penalties pursuant to § 1794, subdivisions (c) and (e) in the alternative and does not seek to cumulate civil penalties, as provided in § 1794(f).

FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF BY PLAINTIFF AGAINST DEFENDANT FAILURE TO COMMENCE REPAIRS WITHIN A REASONABLE TIME AND TO COMPLETE THEM WITHIN 30 DAYS CAL. CIV. CODE § 1794

Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 4 through 6 and paragraph 10, above.

- 6 -COMPLAINT; DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

24

25

26

27

28

ANDERSON LAW FIRM

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

And for such other relief as the Court may deem proper. 7.

DATED: February 1, 2008

ANDERSON LAW FIRM MARTIN W. ANDERSON MICHAEL E. LINDSEY

By:

MARTIN W. ANDERSON Attorneys for Plaintiff Alonso Menchaca

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial on all causes of action asserted herein.

DATED: February 1, 2008

MARTIN W. ANDERSON MICHAEL E. LINDSEY

By:

MARTIN W. ANDERSON Attorneys for Plaintiff Alonso Menchaca

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN DIEGO DIVISION

147438 - BH

February 08, 2008 16:34:17

Civ Fil Non-Pris

USAO #.: 08CV0252 CIVIL FILING

Judge..: M. JAMES LORENZ

Amount.:

\$350.00 CK

Check#.: BC# 1139

Total-> \$350.00

FROM: MENCHACA V. GENERAL MOTORS

CIVIL FILING

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	Brief description of cause: Consumer Warranty Action					
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION						
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	☐ CHECK IF THIS UNDER F.R.C.P	IS A CLASS ACTION 23	ON DEMANDS 197,390.00		CHECK YES only if dem JURY DEMAND:	anded in complaint: ✓ Yes
VIII. RELATED CASE(S IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE		3 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE 3 02/01/2008		SIGNATURE OF	ATTORNEY OF RECORD			
RECEIPT # 147458 AMOU	лт \$3 50 2/8/	08 BH APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	MAG. JUDGE	
ORIGINAL		_				